



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/998,269	11/30/2001	Edward Henry Daray	CA920000077US1	5486

7590

05/05/2004

John L. Rogitz
Rogitz & Associates
Suite 3120
750 B Street
San Diego, CA 92101

EXAMINER

CHEN, CHONGSHAN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2172

DATE MAILED: 05/05/2004

4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

3

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/998,269

Applicant(s)

DARAY ET AL

Examiner

Chongshan Chen

Art Unit

2172

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-27 are pending in this Office Action.

Priority

2. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The reference cited in the IDS, PTO-1449, Paper No. 3, has been considered.

Claim Objections

4. Claims 11-27 are objected to because of the following informalities: Claims are numbered incorrectly. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 1, 4-6, 9-10, 13-15, 18-19, 22-24 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Harvey, III et al. ("Harvey", 5,687,366).

As per claim 1, Harvey teaches a method performed on a computer system operationally coupled to computer readable memory for storing a set of records each having a data key, said

Art Unit: 2172

method for sorting based on collation information of a particular culture pertaining to said set of records, comprising:

reading at least one locale token associated with the set of records, the locale token identifying at least one locale object having collation information (Harvey, col. 5, lines 10-55);

using at least the locale object to locate and read the collation information (Harvey, Fig. 5);

creating at least one culturally correct collation key for at least some data keys associated with at least some records (Harvey, col. 5, lines 43-47, "The Locale Object Manager uses the information in these tables to create keys ..."); and

using at least one culturally correct collation key, sorting the set of records into at least one culturally correct sorted order (Harvey, col. 2, lines 21-22, "The function include sorting service functions").

As per claim 4, Harvey teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, and further teaches said set of records is structured (Harvey, col. 5, lines 36-39).

As per claim 5, Harvey teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 4, and further teaches keyed records of said set of records each includes a data field (Harvey, col. 5, lines 10-59).

As per claim 6, Harvey teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 4, and further teaches said locale token is appended to said set of records (Harvey, Fig. 5-8, col. 8, lines 1-67).

As per claim 9, Harvey teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 4, and further teaches displaying said set of records (Harvey, Fig. 2A, 221, Display).

Claims 10 and 19 are rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for claim 1.

Claims 13-15 and 22-24 are rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for claims 4-6.

Claims 18 and 27 are rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for claim 9.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 2-3, 7-8, 11-12, 16-17, 20-21 and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harvey, III et al. ("Harvey", 5,687,366).

As per claim 2, Harvey teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, except for explicitly disclosing operating the computer system in a distributed computer environment. However, it is well known in the art that distributed processing improves the processing speed and reduces the processing time required. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to operate the computer system in a distributed computer environment in the system of Harvey in order to improve the processing speed and reduce the processing time required.

As per claim 3, Harvey teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 2, and further teaches using a pointer to locate the set of records (Harvey, col. 11, lines 2-3); and using the locale token to identify at least one coded character set (Harvey, col. 9, lines 5-25).

As per claim 7, Harvey teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 4, and further teach creating culturally correct collation key (Harvey, col. 5, lines 43-47). Harvey does not explicitly disclose the creating act is performed using at least one collation engine. However, since the creating act of Harvey is performed by a computer system, the examiner interprets the computer system of Harvey as a collation engine as claimed.

As per claim 8, Harvey teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, except for explicitly disclosing at least one culturally correct collation key is collated using a comparator. However, Harvey teaches sorting the records (Harvey, col. 2, lines 21-22). Sorting operation involves comparison. Therefore, it is obvious that the system of Harvey has comparator.

Claims 11-12 and 20-21 are rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for claims 2-3.

Claims 16-17 and 25-26 are rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for claims 7-8.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Davis (5,440,482) teaches forward and reverse Boyer-Moore string searching multilingual text having a defined collation order.

Edberg (5,873,111) teaches a method and system for collation in a processing system of a variety of distinct sets of information.

Hetherington et al. (6,389,386) teaches a method for sorting text strings.

Sharp (Pub. No.: US 2002/0091691 A1) teaches sorting multiple-typed data.

Contact Information


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chongshan Chen whose telephone number is 703-305-8319. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (8:00 am - 4:30 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E Breene can be reached on (703)305-9790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2172

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

April 17, 2004



SHAHID ALAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER